

# Two results on ill-posed problems <sup>\*†</sup>

A.G. Ramm

Mathematics Department, Kansas State University,  
Manhattan, KS 66506-2602, USA  
ramm@math.ksu.edu

## Abstract

Let  $A = A^*$  be a linear operator in a Hilbert space  $H$ . Assume that equation  $Au = f$  (1) is solvable, not necessarily uniquely, and  $y$  is its minimal-norm solution. Assume that problem (1) is ill-posed. Let  $f_\delta$ ,  $\|f - f_\delta\| \leq \delta$ , be noisy data, which are given, while  $f$  is not known. Variational regularization of problem (1) leads to an equation  $A^*Au + \alpha u = A^*f_\delta$ . Operation count for solving this equation is much higher, than for solving the equation  $(A + ia)u = f_\delta$  (2). The first result is the theorem which says that if  $a = a(\delta)$ ,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a(\delta) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{a(\delta)} = 0$ , then the unique solution  $u_\delta$  to equation (2), with  $a = a(\delta)$ , has the property  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_\delta - y\| = 0$ . The second result is an iterative method for stable calculation of the values of unbounded operator on elements given with an error.

## 1. Introduction

The results of this note are formulated as Theorems 1 and 2 and proved in Sections 1 and 2 respectively. For the notions, related to ill-posed problems, one may consult [1] and [2] and the literature cited there.

Let  $A = A^*$  be a linear operator in a Hilbert space  $H$ . Assume that equation

$$Au = f, \quad (1)$$

is solvable, not necessarily uniquely, and  $y$  is its minimal-norm solution,  $y \perp N := \{u : Au = 0\}$ . Assume that problem (1) is ill-posed. In this case small perturbations of  $f$  may cause large perturbations of the solution to (1) or may throw  $f$  out of the range of  $A$ . Let  $f_\delta$ ,  $\|f - f_\delta\| \leq \delta$ , be noisy data, which are given, while  $f$  is not known. Variational regularization of problem (1) leads to an equation  $A^*Au + \alpha u = A^*f_\delta$ , where  $A^* = A$  since we assume  $A$  to be selfadjoint. Operation count for solving this equation is much higher, than for solving the equation

$$(A + ia)u = f_\delta, \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>\*</sup>Math subject classification: 47A05, 45A50,35R30

<sup>†</sup>key words: linear operators, ill-posed problems, regularization, discrepancy principle

The result of this paper is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $A = A^*$  be a linear bounded, or densely defined, unbounded, self-adjoint operator in a Hilbert space. Assume that  $a = a(\delta) > 0$ ,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a(\delta) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{a(\delta)} = 0$ , then the unique solution  $u_\delta$  to equation (2) with  $a = a(\delta)$  has the property*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|u_\delta - y\| = 0. \quad (3)$$

Why should one be interested in the above theorem? The answer is: because the solution to equation (2) requires less operations than the solution of the equation  $(A^*A + \alpha I)u = A^*f_\delta$  basic for the variational regularization method for stable solution of equation (1). Here  $I$  is the identity operator. Also, a discretized version of (2) leads to matrices whose condition number is of the order of square root of the condition number of the matrix corresponding to the operator  $A^*A + \alpha(\delta)I$ , where  $I$  is the identity operator.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** One has

$$\|u_{a,\delta} - y\| \leq \|(A + ia)^{-1}(f_\delta - f)\| + \|(A + ia)^{-1}Ay - y\| \leq \frac{\delta}{a} + a\|(A + ia)^{-1}y\|. \quad (4)$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a^2 \|(A + ia)^{-1}Ay - y\|^2 = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d(E_s y, y)}{s^2 + a^2} = 0, \quad (5)$$

where we have used the spectral theorem,  $E_s$  is the resolution of the identity corresponding to the selfadjoint operator  $A$ , and we have taken into account that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a^2 \int_{-0}^0 \frac{d(E_s y, y)}{s^2 + a^2} = 0$$

because  $y \perp N$ . From formulas (4) and (5) one concludes that if  $a = a(\delta) > 0$ ,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a(\delta) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{a(\delta)} = 0$ , then the unique solution  $u_\delta$  to equation (2) with  $a = a(\delta)$  satisfies equation (3).

Theorem 1 is proved. □

## 2. Calculation of values of unbounded operators

Assume that  $A$  is a densely defined closed linear operator in  $H$ . We do not assume in this Section that  $A$  is selfadjoint. If  $f \in D(A)$ , then we want to compute  $Af$  given noisy data  $f_\delta$ ,  $\|f_\delta - f\| \leq \delta$ . Note that  $f_\delta$  may not belong to  $D(A)$ . The problem of stable calculation of  $Af$  given the data  $\{f_\delta, \delta, A\}$  is ill-posed. It was studied in the literature (see, e.g., [1]) by a variational regularization method. Our aim is to reduce this problem to a standard equation with a selfadjoint bounded operator  $0 \leq B \leq I$ , and solve this equation stably by an iterative method.

Let  $v = Af$ . This relation is equivalent to

$$Bv = Ff, \quad (6)$$

where  $B := (I + Q)^{-1}$ ,  $F := BA$ ,  $Q = AA^*$  is a densely defined, non-negative, selfadjoint operator, the range of  $I + Q$  is the whole space  $H$ , and  $B$  is a selfadjoint operator,  $0 \leq B \leq I$ , where the inequalities are understood in the sense of quadratic forms, e.g.,  $B \geq 0$  means  $(Bg, g) \geq 0$  for all  $g \in H$ , and  $F := (I + Q)^{-1}A$ .

**Lemma 1.** (see [3]) *The operator  $(I + Q)^{-1}A$ , originally defined on  $D(A)$ , is closable. Its closure is a bounded, defined on all of  $H$  linear operator with the norm  $\leq \frac{1}{2}$ . One has  $(I + Q)^{-1}A = A(I + T)^{-1}$ , where  $T = A^*A$  is a non-negative, densely defined selfadjoint operator, and  $\|A(I + T)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .*

If  $f_\delta$  is given in place of  $f$ , then we stably solve equation (6) for  $v$  using the following iterative process:

$$v_{n+1} = (I - B)v_n + Ff_\delta, \quad v_0 \perp N^*, \quad (7)$$

where  $N^* := \{u : A^*u = 0\}$ . Let  $y$  be the unique minimal-norm solution to equation (6),  $By = Ff$ . Note that  $y = Hy + Ff$ , where  $H := I - B$ .

**Theorem 2.** *If  $n = n(\delta)$  is an integer,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} n(\delta) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} [\delta n(\delta)] = 0$ , then*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|v_\delta - y\| = 0, \quad (8)$$

where  $v_\delta := v_{n(\delta)}$ , and  $v_n$  is defined in (7).

**Proof of Theorem 2.** From (7) one gets  $v_{n+1} = \sum_{j=0}^n H^j F f_\delta + H^{n+1} u_0$ , where  $H := I - B$ . One has  $y = Hy + Ff$ . Let  $w_n := v_n - y$ . Then  $w_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} H^j F g_\delta + H^n w_0$ , where  $g_\delta := f_\delta - f$ , and  $w_0$  is an arbitrary element such that  $w_0 \perp N^*$ . Since  $0 \leq H \leq I$ ,  $\|F\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\|g_\delta\| \leq \delta$ , one gets

$$\|w_n\| \leq \frac{n\delta}{2} + \left[ \int_0^1 (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

where  $E_s$  is the resolution of the identity corresponding to the selfadjoint operator  $B$ .

If  $w_0 \perp N^*$ , then

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 1} \int_h^1 (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) = \|Pw_0\|^2, \quad (10)$$

where  $P$  is the orthoprojector onto the subspace  $\{u : Bu = u\} = \{u : Qu = 0\} = N^*$ , and  $Pw_0 = 0$  because  $w_0 \perp N^*$  by the assumption. The conclusion of Theorem 2 can now be derived. Given an arbitrary small  $\epsilon > 0$ , find  $h$  sufficiently close to 1 such that  $\int_h^1 (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) < \epsilon$ . Fix this  $h$  and find  $n = n(\delta)$ , sufficiently large, so that  $\delta n(\delta) < \epsilon$  and, at the same time,  $(1-h)^{2n(\delta)} < \epsilon$ . This is possible if  $\delta$  is sufficiently small, because  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} n(\delta) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} [\delta n(\delta)] = 0$ . Then  $\int_0^1 (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) \leq \int_0^h (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) + \int_h^1 (1-s)^{2n} d(E_s, w_0, w_0) < \epsilon$ , and inequality (9) shows that (8) holds. Theorem 2 is proved.  $\square$ .

**Remark 1.** It is not possible to estimate the rate of convergence in (8) without making additional assumptions on  $y$  or on  $f$ . In [2] one can find examples illustrating similar statements concerning various methods for solving ill-posed problems.

## References

- [1] V. Morozov, Methods of solving incorrectly posed problems, Springer Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [2] A. G. Ramm, Inverse Problems, Springer, New York, 2005.
- [3] A. G. Ramm, On unbounded operators and applications, (submitted)